1	Shayne Stevenson (pro hac vice)	Julia B. Strickland (SBN 83013)
_	Breanna Van Engelen (pro hac vice)	jstrickland@steptoe.com
2	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP	David W. Moon (SBN 197711)
3	1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000	dmoon@steptoe.com Alina Edep (SBN 341169)
3	Seattle, Washington 98101 Telephone: (206) 623-7292	agatto@steptoe.com
4	Facsimile: (206) 623-7292	STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
•	shaynes@hbsslaw.com	2029 Century Park East, 18th Floor
5	breannay@hbsslaw.com	Los Angeles, California 90067-3086
		Telephone: (213) 439-9400
6	Ben M. Harrington (SBN	Facsimile: (213) 439-9598
	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP	Email: <u>docketing@steptoe.com</u>
7	715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202	
0	Berkeley, California 94710	Attorneys for Defendant American Express
8	Telephone: (510) 725-3000 Facsimile: (510) 725-3001	National Bank
9	benh@hbsslaw.com	
	beim @ nossiaw.com	
10	Knoll D. Lowney, (pro hac vice forthcoming)	
	Claire Tonry (pro hac vice)	
11	SMITH & LOWNEY, PLLC	
	2317 E. John Street	
12	Seattle, Washington 98112	
1.2	Telephone: (206) 860-2883	
13	Facsimile: (206) 860-4187 knoll@smithandlowney.com	
14	claire@smithandlowney.com	
• •	Chaire C simulation whey learn	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
16		
10	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
17		
	NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
18		
19	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
19		
20		
	DIANA THEODORE,	No. 3:23-cv-03710-AMO
21	,	
	Plaintiff,	JOINT INITIAL CASE
22	, , ,	MANAGEMENT STATEMENT
<b>)</b> 2	v.	
23		
24	AMERICAN EXPRESS NATIONAL BANK,	
25		
2.	Defendant.	
26	_ =	
27		
<i>_</i>		
28		

The Parties to the above-captioned action (the "Action") submit this Joint Case Management Statement pursuant to the Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California dated January 17, 2023, Civil Local Rule 16-9, and Rules 16 and 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Counsel for the Parties conferred by Zoom on October 12, 2023 for a Rule 26(f) conference.

## 1. Jurisdiction & Service

This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Subject matter jurisdiction arises under the Truth in Lending Act, as provided at 15 U.S.C. § 1640(e).

The Parties do not dispute that the Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendant, nor dispute that venue is proper in this Court. Defendant has accepted service of the Class Action Complaint (the "Complaint").

## 2. Facts

## *Plaintiff statement:*

This is a nationwide consumer class action case. Plaintiff alleges American Express violated the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. § 1601, et seq.) by imposing unlawful interest charges on Plaintiff and the proposed class. Plaintiff brings claims individually and on behalf of all American Express consumer credit card cardmembers who carried a card balance from at least one billing period to another between March 2022 and today on a variable rate credit card. Plaintiff also alleges violations of the California Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.) individually and on behalf of all American Express consumer credit card cardmembers who carried a card balance from at least one billing period to another between March 2022 and today on a variable rate credit card while a resident of the State of California.

## Defendant statement:

Defendant asserts that Plaintiff's claims are meritless but Plaintiff's dispute must be resolved through individual arbitration pursuant to the arbitration provision in Plaintiff's American Express Platinum Card Cardmember Agreement. Defendant filed a motion to compel arbitration and stay the action on September 22, 2023, which is set for hearing on February 29, 2024.

## 3. Legal Issues

011165-11/2356585 V1

A threshold legal question is whether Plaintiff's claims are subject to mandatory arbitration, as Defendant argues and Plaintiff denies. In addition to the legal question whether to certify the putative class, the core legal issue on the merits in this action asks whether Defendant violated the Truth in Lending Act, and California consumer protection law, by applying interest rate increases to cardmembers' protected balances and subsequent transactions without the required statutory notice and without qualification for any exception to the notice requirement, including the statutory exception for certain variable rate card programs.

## 4. Motions

## a. Pending motions

On September 22, 2023, Defendant filed a motion to compel arbitration and stay the action. Dkt. 18. Plaintiff will file a response to that motion by November 21, 2023, and Defendant will file its reply on or before January 20, 2024. A hearing on the motion to compel arbitration and stay the action is scheduled for February 29, 2024.

## **b.** Prior motions

There are no prior motions.

## c. Anticipated future motions

Plaintiff anticipates filing a motion, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(3), to certify the proposed class of American Express consumer credit cardmembers who carried a balance during the relevant period. Both Parties may file summary judgment motions and *Daubert* motions, as appropriate.

## **5.** Amendment of Pleadings

The Complaint was filed on July 26, 2023. Dkt. 1. Plaintiffs reserve the right to move to amend the Complaint to conform to the evidence uncovered in the course of discovery upon a demonstration of good cause, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15.

## **6. Evidence Preservation**

The Parties have reviewed the Guidelines Relating to the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information and agree to take reasonable and proportionate steps to preserve evidence relevant to the

issues reasonably evident in this action. The parties will discuss agreement on an ESI protocol at the appropriate time, if required, after a ruling on Defendant's motion to compel arbitration.

#### 7. Disclosures

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

By agreement of the parties, initial disclosures pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will not be exchanged prior to the Court's ruling on Defendant's motion to compel arbitration and stay the action.

## 8. Discovery

Defendant objects to all discovery and discovery-related activity prior to a ruling on its pending motion to compel arbitration and incorporates this objection throughout this Joint Initial Case Management Statement.

## a. Discovery Taken to Date

To date, no discovery has been taken in this action.

## **b.** Scope of Discovery

Plaintiff anticipates that discovery will address issues concerning liability, damages, class certification, and defenses.

## c. Proposed Limits or Modifications to Discovery Rules

Plaintiff believes that this case will not warrant an increase from the presumptive limits on the number of depositions set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 30. But the parties agree to meet and confer regarding the appropriate number of depositions. If necessary, the Parties will seek the Court's assistance in resolving any dispute about modifications to the discovery rules.

#### d. E-discovery

The Parties intend on reaching agreement on a protocol governing the production of electronically stored information ("ESI") that will govern document production and discovery in this case, if required, after a ruling on Defendant's motion to compel arbitration. If necessary, the Parties will seek the Court's assistance in resolving any e-discovery disputes.

## e. Discovery Plan

The Parties agree to a stay in discovery pending the outcome of Defendant's motion to compel arbitration and stay the action.

JT. CASE MGMT. STMT. - 3 Case No.: 3:23-CV-03710-AMO 011165-11/2356585 V1

The Northern District of California's Guidelines for the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information, Guideline 2.02(d) instructs the Parties to adopt procedures "so that discovery occurs first from sources most likely to contain relevant and discoverable information and is postponed or avoided from [other] sources." Plaintiff proposes that if and when discovery commences in this action, that documents should be produced on a rolling basis, and that certain custodians and categories of documents should be prioritized for production. Privilege logs would then also be produced on a rolling basis.

## f. Discovery Disputes

There are no discovery disputes at this time.

## g. Protective Order

The Parties have agreed to adopt this District's model Stipulated Protective Order for Standard Litigation (copy attached as Exhibit A) in this action, if required, after a ruling on Defendant's motion to compel arbitration.

## 9. Class Actions

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff anticipates that she will move, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(3), to certify a class consisting of all American Express consumer credit card cardmembers who carried a card balance from at least one billing period to another between March 2022 and today on a variable rate credit card. All counsel of record for the Parties have reviewed the Procedural Guidance for Class Action Settlements.

## 10. Related Cases

The Parties are not aware of any cases that concern substantially the same parties, transactions, happenings or events, or would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

#### 11. Relief

Through this action, Plaintiff seeks (i) certification of the proposed Class and Subclass, including appointment of Plaintiffs' counsel as Class Counsel; (ii) actual damages, punitive and statutory damages, restitution, and injunctive relief prohibiting the defendant from engaging in the wrongful conduct alleged in the Complaint; (iii) reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and pre-and-post-judgement interest; and (iv) such other or further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

JT. CASE MGMT. STMT. - 4 Case No.: 3:23-CV-03710-AMO

011165-11/2356585 V1

# 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

#### 12. Settlement and ADR

The Parties have not engaged in settlement discussions. The Parties have met and conferred regarding ADR and agree that efforts to resolve this case are not appropriate at this time.

#### 13. Other References

The Parties agree that the case is not suitable for reference to non-binding arbitration, a special master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, pending a ruling on Defendant's motion to compel arbitration.

## 14. Narrowing of Issues

The Parties are unable to agree at this stage of the proceedings to narrow the issues before the Court, but agree to remain in contact about ways to potentially narrow issues.

## **15. Expedited Trial Procedure**

The Parties do not believe that this is the type of case that can be handled under the Expedited Trial Procedure of General Order 64, Attachment A.

## 16. Scheduling

The Parties agree to a stay in discovery pending the Court's ruling on Defendant's motion to compel arbitration and stay the action. A hearing on that motion is set for February 29, 2024.

## 17. Trial

The Parties have requested a trial by jury. The Parties estimate that a trial may last between one and two weeks.

## 18. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons

Plaintiff filed her Certificates of Interested Entities on October 19, 2023. ECF No. 32. Defendant filed its Certificate of Interested Entities on October 20, 2023. ECF No. 33.

#### 19. Professional Conduct

The attorneys of record for the Parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Northern District of California.

26

22

23

24

25

27

28

1	DATED this 26th day of October, 2023.	Respectfully submitted,
2		HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
3		By /s/ Shayne C. Stevenson
4		Shayne Stevenson (pro hac vice)
5		Breanna Van Engelen ( <i>pro hac vice</i> ) 1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000
6		Seattle, Washington 98101
		Telephone: (206) 623-7292 Facsimile: (206) 623-0594
7		shaynes@hbsslaw.com
8		breannav@hbsslaw.com
9		Ben M. Harrington
10		HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202
11		Berkeley, California 94710
		Telephone: (510) 725-3000
12		Facsimile: (510) 725-3001 benh@hbsslaw.com
13		
14		Knoll D. Lowney (pro hac vice forthcoming) Claire Tonry (pro hac vice)
15		SMITH & LOWNEY, PLLC
13		2317 E. John Street
16		Seattle, Washington 98112
17		Telephone: (206) 860-2883 Facsimile: (206) 860-4187
1.0		knoll@smithandlowney.com
18		claire@smithandlowney.com
19		Attorneys for Plaintiff
20		STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
21		STEI TOE & JOHNSON EEI
22		By <u>s/ David W. Moon</u> David W. Moon (SBN 197711)
23		dmoon@steptoe.com
24		Julia B. Strickland (SBN 83013)
		jstrickland@steptoe.com Alina Edep (SBN 341169)
25		agatto@steptoe.com
26		2029 Century Park East, 18th Floor
27		Los Angeles, California 90067-3086 Telephone: (213) 439-9400
28		Facsimile: (213) 439-9598
20		

JT. CASE MGMT. STMT. - 6 Case No.: 3:23-CV-03710-AMO 011165-11/2356585 V1

## Case 3:23-cv-03710-AMO Document 34 Filed 10/26/23 Page 8 of 9

1	Email: docketing@steptoe.com
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

JT. CASE MGMT. STMT. - 7 Case No.: 3:23-CV-03710-AMO 011165-11/2356585 V1

28

## ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIV. L.R. 5-1(i)(3) I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of the foregoing document has been obtained from

each of the other Signatories.

/s/ Shayne C. Stevenson Shayne C. Stevenson

JT. CASE MGMT. STMT. - 8 Case No.: 3:23-CV-03710-AMO 011165-11/2356585 V1